

In re MARK A. ROSS, Application No. 09/910,227  
Amendment C

### REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Notice of Allowance mailed in this matter on April 5, 2005, designating that all claims are allowed. Applicant requests the enclosed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and the amendments presented herein be entered, and the remarks presented herein be considered. Reconsideration and/or further prosecution of the application is respectfully requested. No new matter is added.

Applicant has elected to take this opportunity to clean up the claims based on current drafting preferences, rather than based on any prior art. More specifically, independent claims 1, 12, 18, 23, 26, 31, 39, 46, 52, 55, and 59 are amended to give a context to the comparison operation such as to verify the integrity of a result, whether or not there was a data protection error, whether or not an error exists, or some variant thereof. Support for such amendments are provided pervasively throughout the originally filed application, such as, but not limited to the title, summary, original claim 33, the figures, and throughout the originally filed specification.

In addition, new dependent claims 63-65 are added here to recite that the index introduced in their respective independent claims includes an indication of a position of a matching entry in the content-addressable memory. In other words, the index includes a standard CAM index that is produced by a standard CAM/TCAM, and Applicants admit that a standard prior art CAM/TCAM receives an input word, perform a lookup operation thereon (i.e., compares all its populated entries against the input word), to produce one or more indexes of positions of entries that matched the lookup word, and possibly includes a priority encoder to identifying the single highest-priority index/position of the highest priority matching entry. Support for these new claims is provided at least on pages 6-8. New claims 63-65 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons the Office determined their independent claims are allowable.

In regards to other amendments: claim 26 is amended to reword the claim and to recite that the index is generated based on a lookup operation with support provided at least by originally filed claim 26, FIG. 3A and pages 6-8 of the originally filed application; claim 31 is

In re MARK A. ROSS, Application No. 09/910,227  
Amendment C

amended to recite first and second portions of the index, with support provided at least by FIG. 3A and pages 6-8 of the originally filed application; and claim 33 is amended to recite portions of the index with support provided at least by FIG. 3A and pages 6-8 of the originally filed application.

Applicant believes that these amendments merely clean-up the claims for issuance and are not provided in response to any prior art or pending rejection of a claim as evident by the Notice of Allowance of the all previously pending claims, do not add any new matter as they are supported by the originally filed application, and that all pending claims are allowable over the prior art of record for that least the same reasons all previously pending claims currently stand allowed.

Applicant filed this RCE in order to make the Office aware of its position on Bechtolsheim et al., US Patent 6,377,577. After much further and painstaking investigation, Applicant withdraws its removal of Bechtolsheim et al., US Patent 6,377,577 as prior art. Applicant believes that it is still proper to remove it as being prior art under 103/102(e). However, Applicant now believes that a product including the citations within Bechtolsheim et al. used by the Office in one or more previous Office actions in this application refer to matter that was on sale or publicly disclosed in middle to late 1999, which Applicant believes would make the product (and this included material) prior art under 102(b). As Applicant believes that Bechtolsheim et al., US Patent 6,377,577 is the best statement of the relevant portion of the prior art product, Applicant therefore believes that by making such a withdraw of Bechtolsheim et al., Applicant has fulfilled its duties of candor and disclosure to the USPTO. Of course, Applicant reserves the right to withdraw from being prior art any portion of Bechtolsheim et al., US Patent 6,377,577, that was not used in a prior art product or otherwise on sale or publicly disclosed.

Applicant still maintains that the claims are patentable over all known prior art and all prior art of record, for at least the reasons that the Office allowed all pending previously presented claims, including the Office's withdraw as documented in the September 8, 2005, Office action of the 102(e) rejections of the claims based on Bechtolsheim et al. in the January

In re MARK A. ROSS, Application No. 09/910,227  
Amendment C

31, 2005, Office action. Applicant notes that the 103/102 withdraw of the reference for common ownership would not have had any bearing on a straight 102 rejection. Moreover, Applicants believe that all pending claims are patentable over Bechtolsheim et al., US Patent 6,377,577, alone or in combination with any other prior art of record, for at least the reasons supplied in Amendment A, filed on May 2, 2005, in this matter (and based on which the Office withdrew its 102 rejections based on Bechtolsheim et al., US Patent 6,377,577). Rather than repeating them here, the remarks made in Amendment A are hereby incorporated by reference. Again, the claims are quite different than Bechtolsheim et al., US Patent 6,377,577, alone or in combination with any other prior art of record.

Therefore, Applicant believes this matter is in condition for allowance and issuance.

In view of the above remarks and for at least the reasons presented herein, all pending claims are believed to be allowable over the prior art of record, the application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Office is respectfully requested to issue a timely Notice of allowance in this case. Applicant believes that no extension of time is required, but hereby petitions any extension of time required and has included herewith a credit card payment form (PTO-2038) for payment of the RCE and additional claim fees, and Applicant's representative hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge/credit any additional fees due in regards to this correspondence to Deposit Account No. 501430.

Respectfully submitted,  
**The Law Office of Kirk D. Williams**

Date: June 10, 2006

By



Kirk D. Williams, Reg. No. 42,229  
One of the Attorneys for Applicant  
CUSTOMER NUMBER 26327  
The Law Office of Kirk D. Williams  
1234 S. OGDEN ST., Denver, CO 80210  
303-282-0151 (telephone), 303-778-0748 (facsimile)